



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,446	01/14/2002	Max Copperman	1546.015US1	1061

21186 7590 05/04/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/047,446

Applicant(s)

COPPERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) [X] Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
2a) [] This action is FINAL. 2b) [X] This action is non-final.
3) [] Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) [X] Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-24 and 43-61 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) [] Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) [X] Claim(s) 1-11, 25-31 and 36-42 is/are rejected.
7) [] Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) [] Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) [] The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) [] The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) [] accepted or b) [] objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) [] The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) [] Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) [] All b) [] Some * c) [] None of:
1. [] Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. [] Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. [] Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

[Handwritten Signature]

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) [X] Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) [] Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) [] Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) [] Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) [] Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) [] Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. The response to election/restriction filed on January 24, 2005 has been received and entered. Claims 12-24, 32-35, and 43-61 have been withdrawn with traverse. Claims 1-11, 25-31, and 36-42 are pending for current examination.
2. Claims 12-24, 32-35, and 43-61 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Inventions II, and III there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on January 24, 2005.
3. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on January 24, 2005 is acknowledged. No arguments were submitted with respect to the traversal.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2165

5. Claims 1-7, 11, 25-28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abu-Hakima (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,331 B1).

As to claims 1, and 25, Abu-Hakima discloses a method of steering a user to a document needed by the user, the method including:

receiving from the user a user query including language (See Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 60-67, wherein “user query language” reads on “input”);

determining whether at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 1-24) at least one concept feature associated with a concept in a plurality of concepts that are pregrouped into a plurality of groups (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24), and in which each concept includes at least one concept feature that is also in at least one document in a plurality of documents (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 15-24), and in which each document that includes a concept feature is mapped to the concept that includes the concept feature (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 14-24); and

presenting to the user, if the at least one feature in the user query language (See Abu-Hakima column 5, lines 30-52, wherein “user query language” reads on “key words”) substantially matches the at least one concept feature associated with a concept, at least one indication of at least one document associated with the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 1-13, wherein “indication” reads on “highlighter”).

As to claims 2, and 26, Abu-Hakima discloses further including presenting to the user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 1-13,

wherein “indication” reads on “highlighter”).

As to claims 3, and 27, Abu-Hakima discloses further including:

presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima abstract, also see Abu-Hakima column 2, lines 51-57);

receiving from the user a selection of at least one related concept (See Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 25-35); and

presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one document associated with the user-selected related concept (See Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 1-13, wherein “indication” reads on “highlighter”).

As to claims 4, and 27, Abu-Hakima discloses in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one document associated with the user-selected related concept includes presenting to the user the at least one indication of the at least one document associated with both the user-selected related concept and the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 36-65).

As to claim 5, Abu-Hakima discloses further including presenting to the user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 1-13, wherein “indication” reads on “highlighter”).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 6, Abu-Hakima discloses in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept and the presenting to the user at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user a paired indication of:

(1) a matched concept, and (2) a corresponding related concept (See Abu-Hakima column 5, lines 35-56, wherein “related” reads on “linking two different subjects”).

As to claim 7, Abu-Hakima discloses further including ranking related concepts (See Abu-Hakima column 2, lines 16-40).

As to claims 11, and 31, Abu-Hakima discloses a computer-readable medium for performing the method of claims 1, and 25 (See Abu-Hakima column 1, lines 10-15, field of the invention).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8-10, and 29-30 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious over Aggarwal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138481 A1).

As to claim 8, Abu-Hakima does not teach in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user ranked indications of related concepts.

Aggarwal et al. teaches in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user ranked indications of related concepts (See Aggarwal et al. page 3, paragraphs 0040-0041).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abu-Hakima to include in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user ranked indications of related concepts.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abu-Hakima by the teaching of Aggarwal et al. to include in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user ranked indications of related concepts because it produces optimal results and efficient searches (See Aggarwal et al. page 2, paragraph 0012).

As to claims 9, and 29, Abu-Hakima does not teach in which the ranking related concepts includes ranking using a number of times that that the related concept was previously-selected by at least one user.

Aggarwal et al. teaches in which the ranking related concepts includes ranking using a number of times that that the related concept was previously-selected by at least one user (See Aggarwal et al. page 4, paragraphs 0051-0052).

Art Unit: 2165

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abu-Hakima to include in which the ranking related concepts includes ranking using a number of times that that the related concept was previously-selected by at least one user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abu-Hakima by the teaching of Aggarwal et al. to include in which the ranking related concepts includes ranking using a number of times that that the related concept was previously-selected by at least one user because it produces optimal results and efficient searches (See Aggarwal et al. page 2, paragraph 0012).

As to claims 10, and 30, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses further including promoting a related concept in the ranking if a previous selection by the at least one user resulted in an inferred success in returning at least one relevant document (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 15-61, also see Aggarwal et al. page 3, paragraph 0041, wherein “previous selection by the at least one user resulted in an inferred” reads on “implied concept”).

8. Claims 36-42 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being obvious over Abu-Hakima (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,331 B1).

As to claim 36, Abu-Hakima discloses a method of steering a user to a document needed by the user, the method including:

receiving from the user a user query including language (See Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 60-67, wherein “user query language” reads on “input”);

determining whether at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches at least one concept feature (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 1-24) associated with a concept in a plurality of concepts that are pregrouped into a plurality of primary groups, in which the primary groups include a Products group (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24), each concept including as evidence at least one concept feature that is also in at least one document in a plurality of documents (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 15-24);

presenting to the user, if the at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches the at least one concept feature associated with a concept (See Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 1-24, also see Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 60-67, wherein “user query language” reads on “input”):

at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 5, lines 45-65, wherein “indication” reads on “counts the number of matches”); and

at least one indication of at least one document associated with the at least one matched concept (See Abu-Hakima column 6, lines 45-61).

Abu-Hakima discloses the claimed invention except for groups include an Activities group, a Symptoms group, a Products group, and an Objects group. Abu-Hakima does not explicitly teach the subject heading for each primary group as listed in the claim (but teaches it to be user defined), however he teaches user assigned primary groups specifically including a Products group.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to assign different headings to primary concept groups since it is known in the database art that concept groups are user definable.

As to claim 37, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses in which the related concept is obtained from a derived group mapping relationships between primary group concept nodes from the same or different primary groups (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24, where it is obvious that the concept has a user defined subject, also see Abu-Hakima column 3, lines 36-65).

As to claim 38, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of**:

an Activities and Objects group, including at least one relationship between an Activities concept and an Objects concept;

an Activities and Products group, including at least one relationship between an Activities concept and a Products concept;

a Symptoms and Objects group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and an Objects concept;

a Symptoms and Products group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and a Products concept (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24, where it is obvious that the concept has a user defined subject); and

a Symptoms and Activities group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and an Activities concept.

As to claim 39, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of:**

an Activities and Activities group, including at least one relationship between different Activities concepts;

an Objects and Objects group, including at least one relationship between different Objects concepts;

a Symptoms and Symptoms group, including at least one relationship between different Symptoms concepts; and

a Products and Products group, including at least one relationship between different Products concepts (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24, where it is obvious that the concept has a user defined subject).

As to claim 40, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of:**

at least one lexically-similar group, including at least one relationship between lexically similar concepts; and

at least one semantically-similar group, including at least one relationship between semantically similar concepts (See Abu-Hakima column 7, lines 25-43).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 41, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses in which the primary groups consist only of Products, Activities, Symptoms, and Objects groups (See Abu-Hakima column 4, lines 1-24, where it is obvious that the concept has a user defined subject).

As to claim 42, Abu-Hakima as modified discloses a computer-readable medium for performing the method of claim 36 (See Abu-Hakima column 1, lines 10-15, field of the invention).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Application/Control Number: 10/047,446

Page 12

Art Unit: 2165

April 29, 2005



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER